Telecast Script

Segment 1: For scorers

Introduction

Hello. My name is Lee Ann Hager, and I am the high school writing consultant for the Kentucky Department of Education. Welcome to the Spring 2007 Portfolio Scoring Telecast. This segment is designed for cluster leaders and scoring teams to be viewed during the scoring training session and reviewed, if necessary, prior to the scoring session.

I am accompanied today by Dena Cole, middle school writing consultant, and Depeka Croft, elementary writing consultant.

During this segment, cluster leaders and scorers will consider the differences in analytical scoring vs. holistic scoring. We will be reviewing the criteria on the *Kentucky Writing Scoring Rubric* to help ensure consistency of understanding the content standards in the subdomains and indicators.

We will review the progression of the language of each criterion on the rubric, and consider what differentiates one cell number from another. At the end of this segment, Depeka will review the process of scoring a portfolio using the rubric and score report form to help prepare you for scoring live portfolios.

In the next portion of this telecast, Dena will review with you the differences between Analytical and Holistic scoring.

Analytical vs. Holistic Scoring

The change from analytical scoring to holistic scoring began with this school term 2006-2007. The decision to make this change along with several other adjustments to the assessment of writing was made by the Kentucky Board of Education in order to promote a scoring process that was <u>less subjective</u> and <u>more effective</u> in providing instructional feedback to students, teachers, and administrators.

To help further your understanding of the analytical process, it is essential to note the differences in analytical versus holistic scoring.

(Go to the chart)

On the screen you will see a chart showing the differences of the two scoring methods. As I take you through this chart, I will point out the advantages of using analytical scoring versus holistic scoring.

1. In comparing the procedure between the scoring styles, holistic seems shorter, but analytical scoring focuses on the scoring of each criterion. Therefore, very specific feedback about each criterion will be available to students, teachers and administrators.

2. As we look at the tools needed to score, the holistic method of scoring required many more tools to help the scorer to pinpoint the correct performance level. With analytical scoring, the specific criterion indicators and anchor papers help in understanding the language in each cell number on the scoring rubric. Note: We are changing the language from "guide" to "rubric" to help distinguish between the two.

3. You can see on the chart that the criteria used for the development and scoring have stayed the same. However, teachers that have used the rubric with their students have found that the analytical scoring rubric is more "student friendly" because of the specific language in the indicators. Also, teachers in all content areas have found the rubric easier to understand for instruction and to use during scoring sessions.

4. The next part of the chart looks at the training needed for each scoring method. The required scoring training of 3 hours will stay the same. However, this year, it is essential for schools to incorporate 6 hours of scoring training because of the change in scoring procedures and new scoring materials.

5. Finally, the ways of determining, calculating, and reporting the scores have changed to eliminate any calculation errors and initiate KDE's push to an electronic method of reporting scores.

(Go Back to Dena)

Hopefully, this discussion of analytical vs. holistic scoring has helped clarify your thinking about the analytical scoring process.

Next, Lee Ann is going to take you through the scoring rubric language and elaborate on selected words or phrases.

Review use of *Kentucky Writing Scoring Rubric*, role of score report form and role of anchor papers

During a scoring session, the materials scorers will need include the *Kentucky Writing Scoring Rubric*, score report forms and a set of the grade-specific anchor papers. Cluster leaders may also ask scorers to keep a copy of the instructional analysis form to record any particular trends or strengths and weaknesses in the portfolios they score.

While many of you may already be familiar with the Kentucky Writing Scoring Rubric, some of you may not be. To help everyone understand the language we will be using to describe the specific parts of the scoring rubric, we will begin by reviewing several terms that you may find helpful.

First, as you look at the rubric, you will see that it is divided into three sections. These sections are called sub-domains. The three subdomains of writing that we are evaluating are the subdomains of Content, Structure, and Conventions. Each of the subdomains is in gray on the rubric and indicates what criteria are contained within those subdomains. For example, under **Content**, you see that it includes purpose and audience; idea development and support. The subdomain of **Structure** includes organization and sentences; the **Conventions** subdomain includes grammar and usage, word choice, and correctness.

You will also notice that there are five columns on the rubric numbered 0-4 for content and structure and 1-4 under conventions. These numbers are called cell numbers. Each cell number applies to a particular cell on the rubric. All together there are fourteen numbered cells on the scoring rubric allowing scorers to break down the evaluation of the piece of writing analytically by criterion.

Each subdomain is further broken down into indicators. Each subdomain is composed of three indicators measuring a certain criterion. For example, in the subdomain of content, there are three indicators: the purpose indicator, the audience indicator, and the idea development indicator.

A teacher who wishes to use this rubric to score an individual piece of writing may do so by marking these "boxes to check" on the rubric.

Since scores are reported at the subdomain level, scorers should understand how to find a subdomain score. For example, if a scorer evaluated a piece of writing in a student's portfolio and found that the indicators that best described it were a 3 in purpose, a 3 in audience, and a 2 in idea development, that scorer would assign the subdomain score of 3 as the 3 was the most frequent score in the indicators. Then, the scorer would follow the same process to arrive at subdomain scores for structure and conventions.

The question always arises, "What do we do if we have don't have a most frequent score, for example a 1, 2, and 3?" While this is a valid question it is highly unlikely that this situation could ever happen. Because the writing criteria are so interdependent, it is difficult to imagine a student who has an authentic insightful purpose with only "some" audience awareness or idea development, or a student who "lacks purpose" but is still able to demonstrate sufficient idea development. If you find this situation during your scoring, it is more likely that there is a scoring error than a true three cell number span. In these cases, it is especially important that you reference the grade-specific anchor papers to help clarify the language of the rubric.

During the next portion of the telecast, we will consider the subdomains and indicators specifically defining any new language to the rubric. Then we will consider the method of gathering this data in the score report form.

Cut to slide (Subdomain)

Slide—language of subdomain.

There is some new language on the rubric that we want to make you familiar with. Under content, you will find these terms that are new to the rubric or may need clarification for scorers.

These examples include "authentic" and "insightful" purpose; distinctive voice; audience's needs, reflective, analytical and/or insightful idea development, and characteristics of the genre.

Cut to Lee Ann

During our discussion of the progression of language in the indicators, I will clearly define this new language for you.

To facilitate this discussion, you may want to have a copy of the *Kentucky Writing Scoring Rubric* in front of you. Remember, as you score a piece within a portfolio, you are looking for the language of each indicator that best describes the piece you are scoring.

Let's begin by looking at the progression of language on the rubric for the purpose indicator

Slide—purpose indicator
Read slide, cut to Lee Ann

Beginning in the 0 cell, the indicator says that the writing lacks purpose. Writing that seems to contain no particular reason or purpose would earn the score of 0. Moving up that scale, the 1 indicator suggests that the writing demonstrates an attempt to establish a general purpose. The writing isn't successful with doing much with the purpose, but the reader can see that attempt. What differentiate a general purpose and an attempt at a narrowed purpose is that the 2 level writer has, in some way, narrowed the focus and purpose attempting to achieve that purpose in the writing. For example, a student may write with the general purpose of describing everything about a particular trip he or she took. The level 2 writing would demonstrate a narrowing of that purpose, perhaps discussing a specific part of the trip that was particularly enjoyable. Level 2 writing attempts this narrowed purpose and is somewhat successful, but cannot quite make it work throughout the writing.

The difference between a 2 and a 3 writer in regard to purpose has to do with the ability of the student to establish and maintain an authentic focused purpose. Level 3 writing establishes an authentic purpose early in the piece and sufficiently maintains it throughout the writing. This writer accomplishes the intended task. Level 4 writing accomplishes the intended task with an authentic and insightful purpose. The word "authentic" suggests that the writing is the student's own, done for a realistic, genuine reason or purpose. Given that a three and a four level writing call for an authentic purpose, students who complete pieces that are academic exercises never intended for publication will not likely earn a 3 or 4 in this indicator.

The phrase "insightful purpose" suggests that the purpose in writing shows the writer's ability to understand the inner nature of a subject or topic. The student shows insight related to the purpose. For example, level 3 writing may achieve an authentic purpose by focusing on solving a problem within the classroom. Perhaps students are being disruptive and the writer suggests solutions to this problem. Level 4 writing moves beyond that indicating "insight" into the problem. This student is also writing to an authentic purpose but, in this example, may demonstrate the consequences to student learning if the problem isn't solved. The student shows insight by focusing on particular observations related to the subject or topic.

"Distinct voice" in writing suggests a unique voice to the student; it illustrates a sincere sense of investment from the writer. Distinctive voice reveals a genuine sound and rhythm to the writing.

The second indicator is the audience awareness indicator. The phrase "audience's needs" is new to the language of this rubric. An awareness of audience's needs suggests that within the piece of writing, the writer is targeting a specific readership by including those specifics to meet the needs of that readership. Examples of being "aware of audience's needs" goes much further than merely indicating an audience (e.g., in a letter "Dear Mom"); Rather, the writer would meet the needs of the reader by perhaps referencing background knowledge the reader would likely have or adding more information that the reader may need to fully understand the writing. Strategies such as organizing and developing ideas also help meet the readers needs as well.

Cut to Audience Awareness Indicator

Along the continuum for audience awareness, we move from a 0 level writing that completely lacks any awareness of an audience, to the level four writer who has strong awareness of the audience's needs in the writing.

The next indicator is the idea development indicator. From 0-4, we see a range of student performance. While the level 0 writing lacks idea development, level 1 writing contains some limited idea development—the ideas may be present, but they do not do anything relevant to a purpose. The 2 writer has some idea development; the 3 level writer has depth of idea development and the 4 level writer achieves this depth through reflective, analytical and/or insightful idea development.

Some questions that have arisen related to the idea development indicator include the "reflective, analytical and/or insightful" idea development from the four cell. Compared with the 3 cell which references depth of idea development with specific, sufficient details/support, the four writer achieves this depth using strong reflection, analysis and/or insight.

The other phrase that may cause questions is "characteristics of the genre." Characteristics of the genre include those qualities which readers typically expect to see in a given genre or form of writing. However, characteristics of the genre are more than characteristics of format or form. While columns and headings are characteristics of the article genre, so are engaging leaders and the logical organization of ideas. Characteristics of the genre may be format issues, but they may also be those characteristics inherent in a given genre.

The second subdomain is the subdomain of Structure. This subdomain includes the indicators for organization, transitional elements and sentence structure.

New language that we will consider connected to the organization indicator is "careful and/or subtle organization"; transitional elements; and "enhances purpose" and "enhances meaning."

The first indicator in the subdomain of structure is the indicator for organization. The 0 writer demonstrates random organization. In other words, this writer seems to have no apparent organizational plan in the writing. Parts of the writing may be rearranged and not influence meaning in any way. The 1 level writing demonstrates ineffective or weak organization. Level 1 writing may have some organizational pattern, but it does not work or it is so weak that it does influence the purpose or audience. Level 2 writing, however, demonstrates logical organization. Sometimes level 2 writing may be formulaic, but it is logical. This level writing has lapses in coherence. The writing may be somewhat organized, but not sufficiently so.

Level 3 writing demonstrates logical, coherent organization. Everything in the piece is organized sufficiently and holds together throughout the writing. Level 4 writing demonstrates careful and/or subtle organization. Careful organization is purposeful. Subtle organization is, perhaps not apparent on first glance. Writing that exhibits careful and/or subtle organization goes beyond the logical. It is not formulaic, but specifically organized to enhance the purpose of the writing. This level writing indicates clear decision-making on the part of the writer about how best to organize given the particular purpose of the piece.

The second indicator in Structure is the indicator of "transitional elements." Transitional elements are those elements of a piece of writing that function to move the writing smoothly from one part to the next. Transitional words, phrases or sentences may be

considered transitions or transitional elements. However, a student may also use text features such as white space or effective paragraphing as transitional elements.

From 0-4 across the rubric, the writer moves progressively from "lacking transitional elements" to demonstrating limited and/or ineffective transitional elements. The two level writing demonstrates some effective transitional elements while the three and four level writers show logical and effective transitional and varied and subtle transitional elements. "Varied transitional elements" suggests the students use many kinds of transitional elements effectively. "Subtle transitional elements" suggests that the writing moves forward smoothly through the use of transitional elements, even without the reader being aware of their use.

The final indicator for organization is sentence structure. Zero level writing demonstrates inconsistent sentence structure throughout the writing. Level one writing demonstrates ineffective or incorrect sentence structure. Level two demonstrates simple sentences and may attempt more complex structures. However, level two writing lacks control of sentence structure. Level three writing demonstrates control and variety in sentence structure. Level four writing compounds on that control and variety by using sentence structures effective to enhance the meaning of the piece. Sentence structures used to enhance meaning are those that are carefully chosen by the student to suggest something about that which he is describing. For example, if a student is describing a long country walk on a lazy afternoon, he might use long, winding sentences. On the other hand, a student who is trying to emotion and anger of a character in a story might choose short, simple sentences for effect. It is the purposeful use of sentence structure to enhance meaning that differentiates the three and four on this indicator.

Next, we will look at the conventions subdomain. This subdomain includes the indicators for grammar and usage, word choice and correctness. You will notice that there are only four cell numbers for conventions. It is hard to imagine what a piece of writing looks like that contains no use of conventions. Therefore, we will begin with cell number one.

The first indicator in the conventions subdomain is grammar and usage. While grammar and usage has always been important, it was less explicit on the holistic scoring guide. "Language, word choice and correctness" could have influenced a reader's understanding of grammar and usage. However, on the analytical scoring guide, the criterion is very specific.

Grammar and Usage refers to those rules that govern language. These rules function to prescribe the preferred usages of words, phrases and sentences.

Level one writing demonstrates a lack of control in grammar and usage while level two writing demonstrates some control but may contain errors that do not interfere with communication. Level three writing demonstrates control of grammar and usage relative to length and complexity of the piece, while level four writing demonstrates this control to enhance meaning. Grammar and usage, like sentence structure, can be used to enhance

meaning in writing. Through specific usages of words or perhaps the breaking of certain grammatical rules, writers may enhance meaning.

The second indicator in the Conventions subdomain is word choice. Word choice moves from incorrect or ineffective in the level one writing to simplistic and/or imprecise in the level two. Level three writing demonstrates acceptable word choice appropriate for audience and purpose while level four moves one level beyond and demonstrates accurate rich, and/or precise word choice appropriate for the purpose and audience.

The final indicator on this scoring rubric is that of correctness. Correctness includes spelling, punctuation, capitalization, abbreviation and, on the current rubric, documentation. Again, the zero to four continuum shows the writing moving from demonstrating a lack of control in correctness to demonstrating some control of correctness in level two. Level three writing demonstrates control of correctness relative to the length and complexity of the piece while level four writing demonstrates control of correctness to enhance communication. Again, like sentence structure and grammar and usage, students may enhance communication by specifically choosing certain spelling, capitalization or the use of particular punctuation marks. Students who demonstrate a control over correctness and use correctness (or lack of correctness purposefully) to enhance meaning meet the level four indicator.

This overview of the Kentucky Writing Scoring Rubric is just a starting point for scorers to understand and internalize the language of the criteria. It is critical that scorers study the grade-specific anchor papers to see models of these indicators at the various performance levels.

Applying this information to the accurate scoring of a portfolio is critical. Depeka will take viewers through the process of using this language to score an actual portfolio.

(Cut to Depeka)

THE RUBRIC

I am going to model scoring a portfolio using the "Think Aloud" strategy. You will want to have the Writing Scoring Rubric Flow Chart (pg. 3 in Part 1 of the handbook), rubric, and the Score Report form handy.

After reading Step 1 from the flow chart, let's pretend that I have just finished reading the first piece in the portfolio, which is the reflective. So now, I am looking at the rubric. The first subdomain that I am going to score the piece in is Content, so I will begin at the 0 cell with purpose and go across reading and thinking about that piece. I decide that the

purpose of the reflective piece would be a 3, simply because it established and maintained that authentic focused purpose throughout. The writing analyzed and evaluated the growth of the writer all the way through while having the focus of how his teacher had helped him so much in writing by introducing him to the different authors and explaining how they each had a different way of making the reader want to read on. So, on the Score Report Form, I will write a 3 in the line by purpose under the Reflective category.

Next, I am thinking about audience awareness, the next indicator under Content. I go to the 3 Cell for a starting point because that is where the purpose scored. I decide that the audience's needs were met because the writing gave some information that only the teacher would really need to know. There was voice throughout too. So, on the Score Report Form, I will write a 3 in the line by audience.

The next indicator I need to think about is idea development. So, I immediately go to the 3 cell because that is where purpose and audience scored. I read the indicator and think about the depth of the idea that was developed. I didn't think it was quite a 3, so I read the indicator for 2. I decided that it was a 2 because the writing told me how the writer had grown in writing, but did not support it enough with examples of the impact of the growth. Some details were even irrelevant, especially when the writer was talking about using a pen instead of a pencil when writing the piece. I'll write a 2 on the line beside idea development.

If I were having trouble deciding which cell matches the writing, I would refer to the Anchor Paper under the subdomain that I was having difficulty with.

According to Step 3 on the flow chart, I have to establish a score for Content. On the Score Form, it says most frequent score-so in this, I have a 3,3,2, so the most frequent score that I will record in the box will be a 3.

In Step 4 of the flowchart, the directions say to repeat the procedure for Structure and Conventions. So, I am going to follow the same procedure that I did in Content, I'll begin by looking at the 0 cell under Structure at the indicator for organization and determine the score and record it on the Score Form and so forth until I have scored the whole piece.

Step 5 says to follow the same procedure for the other 2 or 3 pieces in the portfolio.

FILL OUT THE REST OF THE SUBDOMAINS TO SHOW AN EXAMPLE ON SLIDE.

 If I were the scorer, I would put the Score Form in the portfolio and give it to the Cluster Leader/Facilitator.
The Cluster Leader will remove the form from the portfolio and record the scores on the Portfolio Score Accumulation Form, and give it to the second scorer.

After the 2ⁿᵈ scorer returns the portfolio, the Cluster Leader will record that score on the Accumulation Form and determine if the portfolio will need a third scorer. Remember, this is determined if there are any nonadjacent scores for any subdomains between the two scorers.

Lee Ann now has some closing comments.

Closing

Thank you for your attention during this segment of the Spring 2007 Portfolio Scoring Telecast. Cluster leaders and scorers are invited to review this segment of the telecast prior to the scoring sessions.

Segment 2: For cluster leaders and administrators

Introduction

Hello. My name is Lee Ann Hager, and I am the high school writing consultant for the Kentucky Department of Education. Welcome to the spring 2007 Portfolio Scoring Telecast. This segment is designed for cluster leaders as an overview of responsibilities during the training of your scoring teams and the scoring sessions.

I am accompanied today by Dena Cole, the middle school writing consultant and Depeka Croft, the elementary writing consultant.

During this segment, we will review the responsibilities of cluster leaders by offering suggestions for structuring a scoring session and the discussion of the appropriate use of quality control portfolios. We will also review with you specific forms cluster leaders must keep during and after the training and scoring sessions.

Cluster leaders may reference the handout titled "Cluster Leader's Paperwork/ Duties" provided during the KDE training for a checklist of these responsibilities.

Responsibilities of cluster leaders during scoring training

Cluster leaders have many responsibilities during scoring training and the scoring sessions.

During the scoring training, cluster leaders are responsible for training all scorers using the training framework provided during the KDE spring scoring training session. No scoring may take place prior to the cluster leader receiving this training and its redelivery to the team of scorers.

Cluster leaders must make copies of all scoring materials and practice and training portfolios to be used during the training sessions. CLs also have the responsibility of making certain that the KDE scoring telecast is taped and available for use during the scoring training.

Cluster leaders must keep a record that all scorers have been adequately trained. KDE recommends a six-hour training session, so that all scorers are scoring to standard.

Responsibilities of cluster leaders during scoring sessions

During scoring sessions, the cluster leader has many responsibilities as well. Cluster leaders can make certain the scoring session runs smoothly by being prepared. Again, you may reference the handout titled "CL Paperwork/Duties" for a checklist of materials to have prepared in advance. CLs should make certain they have copied a sufficient amount of score report forms, scoring rubrics, anchor papers and quality control portfolios for use during the scoring session.

The most important duty of the CL during the scoring session is making certain that all scorers are scoring to standard. That means that the cluster leader must review with scorers the Kentucky Writing Scoring Rubric criteria and the anchor papers. CLs must also make certain to use quality control portfolios at the beginning of the session and during other appropriate times during scoring. CLs must maintain adequate quality control records. CLs may choose to structure scoring sessions so that table leaders complete read behinds of each scorer. Cluster leaders must keep quality control records for each scorer each time a quality control sample is read throughout the scoring session(s).

The use of quality control portfolios and samples is mandated by KDE. The use of these portfolios is the only way CLs can make certain that scorers are scoring to standard. CLs choosing to use table leaders should also keep records of the table leader's read-behind scores for quality control purposes.

If, during read-behinds or the scoring of quality control portfolios or samples, cluster leaders find that scorers are off-standards, the cluster leader must make certain that scorers are brought back to standard by reviewing the language of the scoring rubric and the appropriate anchor papers. A scorer who is off-standard should not be allowed to continue to score until that scorer is scoring back on-standard.

After scorers complete a portfolio, CLs are expected to compare the score report forms of the first and second readers. Through this comparision, cluster leaders can determine when a third reader is necessary.

When all scoring is finished for a portfolio, cluster leaders must record this data on the writing portfolio accumulation forms. Cluster leaders are responsible for returning the accumulation forms to the district assessment coordinator in a timely manner. DACs

should be able to indicate a date by which accumulation forms must be returned, so that all assessment information may be shipped to the testing contractor at one time.

The rest of this segment will give cluster leaders more information about how to structure scoring sessions and how to keep read-behind and quality control records.

Dena Cole, the middle school consultant, will provide cluster leaders some suggestions for structuring the scoring sessions.

Structuring a Scoring Session

One significant responsibility of a cluster leader is structuring a scoring session. The information that I present to you in this part will apply to both school and district scoring sessions, if applicable.

For your reference during this part of the telecast, I would like to direct your attention to several different resources that may help you in your understanding of the changes or adjustments that will need to be made to your scoring session components this year. These resources include the Kentucky Writing Handbook, Parts 1 and 2 and the handout given to you in cluster leader trainings entitled: Cluster Leader Paperwork/Duties.

(Show slide of the 4 parts of a scoring session)

Structuring a scoring session involves:
- determining the members to be on your scoring team;
- understanding the scoring design;
- setting a site and time to score;
- and organizing the materials for the scoring session.

Team Makeup
First, I want to talk about your scoring Team Makeup.

In the Kentucky Writing Handbook, Part 2, Chapter 3, page 6, specific instructions are given about the "Team Makeup" for your scoring session. Many of the specifications have not changed from last year.

However, I want to talk about an adjustment that you may need to make to your team makeup. This change involves language from the Writing Portfolio Procedures regulation, 703 KAR 5:010. In section 4 of this regulation, "The classroom teacher primarily responsible for overseeing the completion of a student's writing portfolio shall not serve as a scorer of record for that student's accountability portfolio."

To help clarify this, I would like to discuss the language "classroom teacher primarily responsible..." This "classroom teacher" is the one who has worked the most with a student through instruction and conferencing and has some background or knowledge

about the writer and about all the pieces in the portfolio. Therefore, it would be difficult for this teacher to make unbiased scoring decisions about the student's portfolio.

Also, the language in the regulation focuses on the idea that this classroom teacher overseeing the completion of a whole portfolio <u>cannot</u> be a scorer of record for the accountability portfolio.

Consequently, a content area teacher who takes a student through the writing process with a single piece of writing <u>may</u> serve as the scorer of record because they have only worked with that single piece of writing and not the whole portfolio. Also, that piece could be revised more outside of that content class if the student chooses to do so.

<u>Scoring Design</u>
The Scoring Design is the next component of a scoring session. This part involves the actual scoring process within a scoring session. The design includes the scoring guidelines that should be followed in each scoring session across the state.

According to the handbook, part 2, page 5, beginning with this school year, 2006-2007, all schools must score the completed writing portfolios using a double-blind scoring during a scoring session where all scorers and the scoring leader/facilitator are present. <u>No other options</u> are permitted as in proceeding years of the writing portfolio assessment.

This change will increase the <u>validity</u> and <u>accuracy</u> of the scoring sessions.

In double-blind scoring, scorers do not know the identity of the previous scorer and are unaware of prior scores. Any record of the previous scores should be removed by the scoring facilitator or designee. NO SCORE REPORT FORMS, MARKED SCORING RUBRICS OR SCORER NOTES SHOULD BE LEFT IN THE PORTFOLIO that needs to be scored by the second or third reader.

Continuing in your handbook on pages 6 and 7, you will see the basic steps that should be followed in scoring a portfolio. Later on in this segment of the telecast, elaboration will be given on:

- the forms mentioned in these steps
- clarification about the use of quality control portfolios
- the guidelines you should use to determine the need for a third scorer.

<u>Site and Time for Scoring</u>

When thinking about the structure of your scoring session, it is important to find a place that allows for a "controlled setting." Again, I would like to refer you to the Kentucky Writing Handbook, Part 2, Chapter 3, page 8, for a complete listing of all the guidelines for determining a site and time for the scoring session.

In previous years more options were given, some recommended and some not recommended by KDE. The options have narrowed in order to implement a more "controlled setting," as referenced in the guidelines. The benefit of a controlled setting is that the scoring facilitator is able to monitor the progress of all scorers through the use of the mandated quality control portfolios and the utilization of table read-behinds, if you select to implement the table leader process at your scoring session.

According to the *Administration Code for Kentucky's Educational Assessment Program*, 703 KAR 5:080, Scorers should use the current scoring materials and apply the scoring standards accurately and consistently. A "controlled setting" will assist scoring facilitators in applying the scoring standards accurately and consistently.

 No longer can a scorer score at home or alone outside of the scoring site. Since, the "discussion to resolution" is no longer a step in the scoring process design, the noise level of the scoring session should be very well controlled; and therefore, scorers would not need to go to a quieter area to read and score portfolios.

Materials needed for the scoring session

The final component of a scoring session is getting the materials and forms organized before the scoring session. Being prepared before the session will help create the appropriate conditions for scoring to take place. In the Kentucky Writing Handbook, Part 2, page 8, you can find a basic list of materials needed for a scoring session.

Another handout that may be helpful is entitled: Cluster Leader's Paperwork/Duties. This handout lists all the materials that should be utilized before and during the scoring training. You may certainly add to the list any forms or handouts that may meet the needs of your specific scoring team.

Now, Depeka, is going to discuss a vital part of the scoring design, the use of quality control portfolios.

While Quality Control slide is showing, say:

        Quality Control Portfolios are secure portfolios that have preassigned scores by the Scoring Accuracy Assurance Team. These are used to bring scorers back to the language of the rubric in any subdomain during the scoring of portfolios. The use of the Quality Control Portfolios is mandated by the Kentucky Department of

Education.

    Please have the Quality Control Procedures and the Quality Control Record in front of you. These revised documents are provided to you today.

- Schools should reproduce enough copies of the Quality Control Portfolios so that all scorers will be able to read and score them at the same time, allowing for a short discussion of the portfolios and the scoring criteria and rationale when all scores have been turned in. The elementary and middle school will have three Quality Control Portfolios and the high school will have four. This means that the Cluster Leader/Scoring Facilitator will have nine (elem. and middle) and 12 (high school) Quality Control Portfolio pieces to use for the quality control procedure. Cluster Leaders must designate 1 whole portfolio (three pieces for elem. and middle, four pieces for high school) that will be used with the whole group.
- The use of the Quality Control Portfolio piece must take place after the initial recalibration at the beginning of each scoring session and either after a long break or after lunch again. In addition, schools with proven accuracy use the quality control procedure mid-morning and mid-afternoon in an all-day scoring session.
- Scores from the quality control procedure must be recorded each time on the Quality Control Record and sent to the DACS. Cluster Leaders should keep a copy of the record as well.
- Besides using the mandated Quality Control Portfolio Procedures during the scoring of the portfolios, the use of table leaders may be initiated. This has proven beneficial to larger schools.

QUALITY CONTROL PORTFOLIO PROCEDURES

Steps

1. One piece (example-reflective) from a Quality Control Portfolio will be used after initial recalibration at the beginning of each scoring session. The subdomain scores (content, structure, conventions) must be exact or adjacent.

2. The Cluster Leader/Scoring Facilitator on the Quality Control Portfolio Record will record the scorer's scores.

3. Discussion will follow using the rationale and rubric.

4. If everyone scores the piece from the Quality Control with exact or adjacent subdomain scores, scoring of the live portfolios may begin.

5. If any scorer has one or more of the subdomains' scores nonadjacent (two or more points) in the piece (example-content from the reflective), then he/she will need to discuss with the Cluster Leader/Scoring Facilitator the rubric and the Anchor Papers from the subdomain that was nonadjacent. A second piece (example-literary) from the Quality Control Portfolio will be scored by the scorer. His/her scores will be recorded on the Quality Control Record. Scorer may begin scoring if Quality Control piece is exact or adjacent in each subdomain.

6. The scoring director can monitor the scoring of team members that had nonadjacent scores of the Quality Control Portfolio piece by having them to read another Quality Control piece after scoring at least five portfolios. Record the subdomain scores on the Quality Control Portfolio Record. If any of the subdomain scores are non-adjacent from that piece, discuss the rationale, score, and Anchor Paper of the nonadjacent subdomain. Have the scorer to read one more Quality Control Portfolio piece. Record the subdomain scores. Scorers may continue scoring if Quality Control piece is exact or adjacent in each subdomain.

All copies of the Quality Control Portfolios and the Quality Control Portfolio Record are to be sent back to the DACS after scoring session ends, to be stored with other secure assessment materials.

QUALITYCONTROL PORTFOLIO RECORD

You will write the Quality Control Number (1, 2, or 3) in the 1st column, the piece's name in the next column, the category in the 3rd column, and the true scores in the bottom part of the next three divided boxes of content, structure, conventions. You may have this filled out before the scoring session begins if so desired. Then after scorers score the first piece, you are to record their scores in the top part of the divided boxes. Then, record the difference of the two scorers in the boxes labeled "Differences." If any are nonadjacent (2 or more points in any subdomain), then you will need to discuss the rationale, rubric, and the Anchor Paper that the subdomain was nonadjacent.

Any time you give a Quality Control Portfolio piece to a scorer to score, you are to record the score.

You will be sending these records along with the Principal's Quality Control Portfolio Confirmation sheet to your DAC to keep on file after the scoring session ends. You may want to keep a copy for your records as well. Many times, if an allegation arises from portfolio practices, legal services will request the Quality Control Records, so it is important for you to have copy of them in your files.

Besides using the mandated Quality Control Portfolio Procedures during the scoring of portfolios, the use of table leaders may be initiated. This has proven beneficial to larger schools.

SHOW SLIDE ABOUT TABLE LEADERS

Say:

Now I am going to discuss the main points of a Table Leader responsibilities. Please have in front of you the Table Leader Read-Behind Procedures and the Table Leader Read-Behind Record that you received today. These are revised documents.

Table leaders are chosen from the most experienced and accurate scorers to "read behind" the scorers at their tables (4-5 scorers per table).

Cluster Leaders will direct table leaders to read at least 1 piece from every one or two portfolios of the scorers to ensure consistency. Two of the three subdomain scores must be exact or adjacent with the table leader's scores.

The table leader should choose the piece for "read-behinds" at random from each scorer's finished stack and should provide a "blind " read/scoring. The scores for the Table Leader and the scorer should be recorded on the Table Leader Read-Behind Record. The read-behinds function as a quality control measure.

SHOW SLIDE: **WHAT HAPPENS IF TABLE LEADER DISAGREES WITH SCORER?**

Say:

If the table leader's scores disagree with the scorer's score, the table leader will discuss and clarify the score using the rubric with reader. It is important to note that this table leader's score is not one of the two required scores for accountability purposes. The table leader's score is a quality control measure.

The table leader will monitor the scorer by reading another piece after the scorer has scored another portfolio.

If the table leader disagrees with subdomain scores of the scorer again, the Cluster Leader will discuss the rubric and Anchor Papers that pertain to the nonadjacent scores of the scorer.

The scorer will score a Quality Control Portfolio piece. The score will be recorded on the Quality Control Record. The scorer may continue scoring if subdomain scores are exact or adjacent.

If nonadjacent scores occur, measures may be taken to assign the scorer to other duties in the scoring room.

Table leaders should keep records of all original and read-behind scores on the Table Leader Read-Behind Record. The record will be kept by the Cluster Leader for future reference.

 TABLE LEADER READ-BEHIND RECORD

Say:

This is the record sheet that your table leader will use during the scoring session. In the first column, the table leader will record the portfolio number which is the SSID number, then the category of the piece that she/he did the read-behind with, and then the scores of the scorer and her/his scores.

Remember, this procedure is optional.

The Use of Forms during Scoring Training and Scoring Sessions

We will look at three forms Cluster leaders should become familiar with prior to the training and scoring session.
(Cut to slide)

CLs should be familiar with the Portfolio Analysis form, the Score Report form, and the Writing Portfolio Accumulation form.

The portfolio analysis form can be found on page 10 in the Appendices section of Part II. (Put form on screen). This form is to be completed by scorers during the scoring sessions. It provides a means for scorers to take notes on what they see evident within the portfolio samples. Scorers may make notes about particular strengths and weaknesses of certain portfolio scoring criteria. Likewise, they may make notes about trends they notice within the pieces themselves: certain types of pieces that are particularly strong or weak; pieces that seem to be repeated from portfolio to portfolio, etc. It is appropriate that each scorer has a copy of this portfolio analysis form to return to the CL after the scoring session. The CL may choose to compile this data to be used in instructional and professional development planning.

The score report form is a form CLs and scorers should become very familiar with. This form allows scorers to gather all scoring information on a portfolio on one convenient page. This form allows CLs to compare first and second readers to determine third readers. We will be discussing how to determine a third reader later in this telecast.

The Writing Portfolio Accumulation form is designed to allow CLs to keep all scoring data on first, second and third readers (as necessary) on one document. When portfolio scoring is complete, CLs will return these forms to the DAC or DAC's designee for data input into the computer application.

Using the Score Report Form to Determine the Need for a Third Reader

Another responsibility as a cluster leader/scoring facilitator is to understand how to use the score report form in the scoring session to record scores and then to compare the scores on the report forms, after the double blind scoring, to determine if a third reader is needed.

Lee Ann has reviewed and discussed all the parts of the score report form. For the purpose of this part, I am taking on the role of "cluster leader/scorinf facilitator" to show you a completed score report form for Reader 1 and Reader 2 and then demonstrate how to determine if a third reader is necessary.

(Show slide of the combined score report forms)

Now on the screen, you will see a view of the two score report forms from Reader 1 and Reader 2 that have been combined into one slide. We are just looking at the scores of the reflective piece.

1. As a cluster leader/ scoring facilitator, I know that one of my responsibilities is to collect the score report forms from each reader of a scored portfolio and determine if a third reader is needed.
2. I am looking at the scores from these two readers for the reflective piece and will compare the numbers in the "most frequent score box". I know these numbers can be exact, adjacent (one point), or non-adjacent(two or more points).
    *   Looking at the form on the screen, I begin to compare the scores for content and find them exact. (3&3)
    *   Next, I compare the scores for structure and find them adjacent. (3&2)
    *   Finally, I compare the scores for conventions and find them non adjacent. (2&4)
3. If I find cell that is non-adjacent, I will need to mark this cell by circling the cell on each score report form and then highlight or circle the cell on a clean score report form to be used by the third Reader.
4. I would continue this process of comparing the scores between readers across the whole score report form.

(Go back to Dena)

5. After this process, I would give the score report form with highlighted or circled cells to a third reader to be scored.
6. The third reader may have only 1 cell to score or they may have 3 or 4. This number will vary. However, remember, the third reader will only read and score the pieces in the portfolio that have been marked on the score report form by the cluster leader/scoring facilitator.
    *   For example, the third reader would read the reflective piece and score only the conventions cell.
7. After the third reader scores selected pieces of the portfolio, scoring of that portfolio is complete.
8. The cluster leader/scoring facilitator will then begin to record the data on the accumulation form.

Closing (Lee Ann)

Thank you for your attention during this segment of the Spring 2007 Portfolio Scoring Telecast. Cluster leaders are invited to review this segment of the telecast prior to training scorers and conducting the scoring sessions.